

9

MRZ 8996.1
PATENT**REMARKS**

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Office action dated January 27, 2006 and has amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. Claims 1, 24, 39 and 52-54 have been amended and claim 55 has been added by this Amendment A. Claims 25-38 and 40-51 have been canceled.

Claims 1-24, 39 and 52-55 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed April 23, 2001 failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), because a copy of the article "Build New Contest" was not provided. Applicants filed simultaneously herewith a supplemental information disclosure statement with a copy of the article in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) and respectfully request the Examiner to consider the article.

Canceled Claims

Applicants cancel claims 25-38 and 40-51 from consideration, without prejudice to their patentability, and expressly reserve the right to file one or more continuing applications directed to these claims. Applicants respectfully request examination and allowance of the remaining claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3-38, and 40-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eggleston et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,061,660 (Eggleston). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Eggleston teaches a method for providing incentive programs over a computer network. In particular, the incentive program is downloaded or transmitted to the sponsor for installation and operation at the sponsor's own site after the incentive program is purchased. (Eggleston, FIG. 10, reference character 368; FIG. 11,

10

MRZ 8996.1
PATENT

reference character 388; column 14, lines 50-53; column 19, lines 14-19; and column 19, lines 44-48)

In contrast, the present invention allows the customer " to operate the modified program via **the program processor**, and wherein the participant processor and the customer processor are remote from said program processor and remote from the storage device," as recited in claim 1 and shown in FIG. 1 in the present application.

In the present application, the **customer processor is remote from the program processor** and remote from the storage device. (Specification page 12, lines 4-6) Furthermore, the operating software used to operate the program remains **local** to the program processor. (Specification page 12, lines 12-13) This is completely different from the systems in the cited reference. The Eggleston reference fails to teach or suggest allowing a customer to operate the modified program via a **program processor**, and wherein the participant processor and a customer processor are remote from said program processor and remote from the storage device. Since Eggleston discloses installation and operation at the sponsor's own site, it teaches away from the invention.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit cited reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. As such, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be removed. Additionally, claims 2-23 and 52-54 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 24 recites "said program processor operative with the program wherein the participant processor and the customer processor are **remote** from said program processor and **remote** from the storage device". Thus, Applicants believe claim 24 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claim 55 recites, among other things:

allowing a first customer via a first customer processor and allowing a second customer via a second customer processor to electronically access via a customer processor a browsable catalog of predefined programs stored in a storage device connected to a program processor, said storage device and said program processor being remote from said customer processor and **remote** from said participant processor, wherein the first customer's access and program is independent of the second customer's access and program.

11

MRZ 8996.1
PATENT

Thus, Applicants believe claim 55 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 is allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston et al. (U.S. Patent Number: 6,061,660) in view of Hoffman and Rogelberg "A guide to team incentive systems", Team Performance Management, vol. 4 no. 1, pp. 23, 1998 (Hoffman and Rogelberg). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Hoffman and Rogelberg disclose an incentive system where member of a team earn a reward based on the performance of a team. (page 3, System II). Eggleston, as explained above, teaches a method for providing incentive programs over a computer network where the incentive program is downloaded or transmitted to the sponsor for installation and operation **at the sponsor's own site**.

In contrast and as explained above, the present invention allows the customer "to operate the modified program via **the program processor**, and wherein the participant processor and the customer processor are remote from said program processor and remote from the storage device," as recited in claim 1.

The Hoffman and Rogelberg reference and Eggleston fail to teach or suggest allowing a customer to operate the modified program via a program processor, and wherein the participant processor and a customer processor are remote from said program processor and remote from the storage device as recited in claim 1. As such, the claim 1 is allowable over Eggleston in view of Hoffman and Rogelberg. Claim 2 depends from claim 1; Applicants believe dependent claim 2 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston et al. in view of Symons and Jacobs "A Total Quality Management-Based Incentive System Supporting Total Quality Management Implementation", Production and Operations Management, Vol. 4, No. 3, Summer 1995 (Symons and Jacobs). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Symons and Jacobs disclose an incentive system where a bonus incentive is calculated based on the employee's most recent pay (page 4, Fig. 1). Eggleston, as

12

MRZ 8996.1
PATENT

explained above, teaches a method for providing incentive programs over a computer network where the incentive program is downloaded or transmitted to the sponsor for installation and operation **at the sponsor's own site**.

In contrast and as explained above, the present invention allows the customer "to operate the modified program via **the program processor**, and wherein the participant processor and the customer processor are remote from said program processor and remote from the storage device," as recited in claim 1.

The Symons and Jacobs reference and Eggleston fail to teach or suggest allowing a customer to operate the modified program via a program processor, and wherein the participant processor and a customer processor are remote from said program processor and remote from the storage device as recited in claim 1. As such, the claim 1 is allowable over Eggleston in view of Symons and Jacobs. Claim 39 depends from claim 1; as such, Applicants believe dependent claim 39 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 is allowable.

13

MRZ 8996.1
PATENT**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 24 and 55 are allowable over the cited art. The claims depending from these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the claims as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/BAW/cjl